REMARKS

Claims 1, 13-15, 17, 19-21, 24-27 and 34-42 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 14 and 27 have been currently amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification as filed at, at least paragraph [49].

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I.a **Rejection of Claims 1-13, 27-34 and 36-40 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1 -13 and 27-34, 36-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins, *et al.* (U.S. 6,493,464) in view of Forcier (U.S. 6,499,043). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited documents, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims.
The claimed subject matter generally relates to managing, implementing and interpreting handwritten shorthand entries in a computer system. To this end, independent claim 1, at least in part recites: ***identifying a symbol as a shorthand entry for a text expansion, a program and a function that takes an input and produces an output based at least on the input; ….automatically determining a context in which the handwritten user input is received;…….depending upon the outcome of the choosing step carrying out one or more of tasks selected from a group comprising: displaying the text expansion or launching the program or producing the output of the function with the symbol as the input.*** Similarly claim 27 recites: ***automatically determining a context in which the symbol is received; and executing one or more of either displaying the expanded text or launching the program or generating the function output depending upon the context of the handwritten user input.*** Neither Hawkins, *et al.* nor Forcier teach or suggest such claimed aspects.

Hawkins, *et al.* relates to a pen-based computer text input system capable of interpreting a special pre-defined set of single stroke glyphs. The strokes a classified into three categories namely: precharacter modifier strokes that inform the computer system that a subsequently entered stroke is to be modified by the pre-character modifier stroke in a predefined manner, character strokes that cause a character to be display and post character modifier strokes that effect a modification of a previously entered character in a predefined manner. In accordance with Hawkins, *et al.* a user-maintained glossary could be built wherein the user could define sequences of characters – or symbols, text, or program functions to be associated with a stroke, a multi-stroke combination or sequence of multiple stroke combinations. Thus, Hawkins, *et al.* requires a user to define what a stroke combination means in the user defined dictionary, else the system fails (See Hawkins, *et al.* Fig. 2 steps 103, 104).

On page 3 and page 4 of the Final Office Action dated September 8, 2008, it is erroneously contended that Fig. 9 of Hawkins, *et al.* teaches text expansion aspects recited in the subject claims. At the cited portion, Hawkins, *et al.* discloses a common Japanese method 'romaji' for entering katakana with a keyboard. In order to enter katakana for 'sushi', the user types 'su' and this results in the display of the corresponding katakana symbol. Then the user types 'shi' which results in the display of the corresponding katakana symbol (See Hawkins, *et al.* col. 11 lines 17-24). Accordingly, Fig. 9 shows the sequence of strokes 1, 2 and 3 and resulting display when entering a three stroke katakana character (See Hawkins, *et al.* col. 6 lines 30-31). Therefore, contrary to the assertion in the Final Office Action, it is not the symbol 'h' which is expanded to 'sh'. Rather, the symbol 's' is first entered followed by 'h' which results in the display showing 'sh' and finally when 'i' is entered, the entire text 'shi' is replaced by corresponding katakana symbol as illustrated in step 3 of Fig. 9. Therefore, it is concluded that Hawkins, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest, ***identifying a symbol as a shorthand entry for a text expansion, a program and a function that takes an input and produces an output based at least on the input*** as recited in the subject claims. Further, it fails to teach or suggest ***automatically determining a context in which the handwritten user input is received.***

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Forcier does not make up for this aforementioned deficiency of Hawkins, *et al.* In particular, Forcier relates to implementing input, editing and other manipulation of glyphs including handwritten script, ASCII test, bit-mapped images and drawings in a common document, using a compatible internal representation of the data and a simple, consistent set of user control functions. These functions are invoked using a two-step gesture method that distinguishes between strokes and command gestures and allows use of similar gestures for different functions within the same and different contexts (*See* Forcier Abstract). A two part gesture is disclosed wherein the first part initiates gesture control and *the second part is the gesture itself.* Thus, the processor allows the user to perform a pen action within a document to indicate that *a control gesture is going to be made that should not be* *interpreted as an additional text/drawing stroke.* The pen action stimulates feedback by causing display of a gesture prompt. Therefore, it can be concluded that in accordance with Forcier, the user is required to input the context along with the handwriting in order for the system to differentiate between an input that should be displayed versus an input that should be recognized as a control gesture. (*See* Forcier col. 14 line 40 to col. 16 line 40).

In contrast, the claimed subject matter facilitates associating a symbol as a shorthand entry for a text expansion, a program and an output generating function and based on a context in which the shorthand entry is received- executing tasks associated with one or more of these entities based on an automatically recognized context. For example, a single shorthand entry such as "kbd" may be associated with both an expanded text and with a function or with different expansions based on a context. Thus, if "kbd" is written in the context of a word processing program a text expansion like "keyboard" may appear whereas when "kbd" is written in the context of an operating system shell a program may be launched (*See* applicants' specification as filed paragraph 45, and paragraph 52). As another example, a shorthand entry "dt" may be associated with the word expansion "date" or a function the outputs current date (*See* applicants' specification as filed paragraph 36). Executing such varied tasks based on a context of entry is not taught or suggested by either of the cited documents. This mitigates the need for having specific control gestures as disclosed by Forcier.

In view of at least the aforementioned, it is clear that the cited documents alone or in combination, neither teach nor suggest all aspects of the subject claims. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to independent claims 1, 27 as well as all claims that depend there from.

I.b **Rejection of Claims 14-26, 35, 41 and 42 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 14-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins, *et al.* (US 6,493,464) in view of Forcier (US 6,499,043). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited documents, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter generally relates to associating a shorthand entry with an expanded text and a program and executing an associated function based on whether a handwritten user input includes just the short hand entry or other additional material. To this end, independent claim 14 recites: ***receiving a handwritten user input including at least a first handwritten user input, the first handwritten input being at least a shorthand entry associated with both expanded text and a program*** ….***choosing between either the expanded text or the program depending upon whether the handwritten user input includes the second handwritten user input.*** Hawkins, *et al.* or Forcier, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest such claimed aspects.

As described *supra*, Hawkins, *et al.* relates to a pen-based computer text input system capable of interpreting a special pre-defined set of single stroke glyphs which are classified into three categories. However, it fails to teach or suggest ***the first handwritten input being at least a shorthand entry associated with both expanded text and a program***. Forcier does not make up for the aforementioned deficiency. In particular, Forcier discloses a first and second *handwritten input,* Forcier discloses a first handwritten input followed by a gesture that is not a handwritten input as it specifically teaches that the second gesture should not be interpreted as a text/drawing stroke. (*See* Forcier col.13 lines 35 – 44). Hence, in accordance with Forcier, the first gesture is a specific assigned gesture namely a control gesture and it executes a gesture prompt irrespective of whether or not the system receives a second handwritten input from the user. In fact, Forcier requires the user to remap the pen actions to a different gesture class in order to use those same pen actions to do something else (See Forcier col. 13 lines 57-60). Thus, Forcier does not automatically determine a context associated with a handwritten input from a user but requires specific instructions from the user in order to distinguish between the different aspects of the handwritten user input.

In contrast, the claimed subject matter relates to associating a first handwritten input with both a text expansion and a program and selectively invoking an action associated with either of the text expansion or the program based on whether a handwritten user input includes only the first handwritten user input or the first and a second handwritten user input. For example, if a shorthand entry is associated with both expanded text and a program then either or both may be implemented dependent upon the context in which the handwritten user input containing the shorthand is written. If the handwritten user input is the sole handwritten user input, then the program may be launched as recited in dependent claim 41. If, on the other hand, the handwritten user input is not the sole handwritten user input, then the expanded text may alternatively be inserted and the program not launched as recited in dependent claim 42 (*See* applicants' specification as filed paragraph 52).

In view of at least the aforementioned, it is clear that the cited documents, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all aspects recited in independent claim 14. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to this independent claim, and all claims that depend there from.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP2296US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731